

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of August 11, 2004 rejected claims 9-17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response to this rejection, the

5 Applicants have amended claims 9-17 and 23.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6, 18, 29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schramm et al. (US Pat. No. 6,542,742). The Office Action rejected claims 21-24, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vanghi (US Pat. No. 6,393,276). The Office Action rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanghi  
10 in view of Schramm et al.

The Office Action objected to claims 7, 8, 19, 20 and 25-27 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 20. Claim 1  
15 is now allowable. Claims 2-20 depend from claim 1 and are also allowable.

Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 25. Claim 21 is now allowable. Claims 22-28 depend from claim 1 and are also allowable.

Claims 29 and 31 have been amended to include same/similar limitations as amended claim 1 (allowable claim 20). Thus, claims 29 and 31 are now allowable.

20 Claims 30 and 32 have been amended to include same/similar limitations as amended claim 21 (allowable claim 25). Thus, claims 30 and 32 are now allowable.

All claims are now allowable and a notice of allowance is courteously solicited. Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 17, 2004

By: 

Bruce E. Garlick, Reg. 36,520

**Garlick, Harrison & Markison, LLP**

P.O. Box 160727

Austin, TX 78716-0727

(512) 264-8816

(512) 264-3735 fax